CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART II

For reporting on
School Year 2003-2004

DUE APRIL 15, 2005

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ROOM 229 STATE HOUSE
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204**

OMB Number: 1810-0614
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006

Consolidated State Performance Report: Part II
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Indiana Department of Education

Address:

Room 229 State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Jeffery P. Zaring

Telephone: 317-232-6622

Fax: 317-232-0744

e-mail: jzaring@doe.state.in.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Dr. Suellen Reed, Superintendent of Public Instruction

_____   04/14/05
    Signature   Date

<div style="border:1px solid black; text-align:center;">

I. Improving Basic Programs
Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)

</div>

A. Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools

1. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year.   239

2. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year.   287

B. Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program

For the 2003-2004 school year, please provide the following:

1. Total Number of Title I schools in the State   790

2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State   606

3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State   184

C. Title I, Part A Student Participation

1. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups during the 2003-2004 school year. Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.

Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	21,055
Limited English Proficient	6,816
Homeless	1,687
Migrant	971

Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian/Alaskan Native	214
Asian/Pacific Islander	624
Black, non-Hispanic	34,576
Hispanic	11,653
White, non-Hispanic	71,216
Multiracial*	3,997

*Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

2. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

Title I, Part A student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I schoolwide *programs* (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs during the 2003-2004 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level 2003-2004 School Year					
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
Age 0-2						
Age 3-5	395	1,552	54	12	2,013	1.59
K	9,078	9,626	346	9	19,005	14.99
1	12,623	10,302	403	19	23,348	18.42
2	10,107	10,086	396	35	20,569	16.23
3	6,201	9,357	322	53	15,939	12.57
4	4,081	8,864	275	81	13,264	10.47
5	4,063	8,828	174	94	13,162	10.38
6	2,877	4,136	126	155	7,294	5.75
7	2,006	2,339	85	217	4,647	3.67
8	1,700	2,255	55	288	4,298	3.40
9	136	518	0	423	1,077	0.85
10	78	394	0	310	782	0.62
11	46	277	0	217	540	0.43
12	41	188	0	100	329	0.26
Ungraded	0	126	0	339	465	0.37
TOTALS	53,432	68,848	2,236	2,352	126,732	100

3. Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2003-2004 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, A Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services 2003-2004 School Year	
Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	18,244
Reading/Language Arts	43,693
Science	N/A
Social Studies	N/A
Vocational/Career	N/A
Other (specify)	
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	1,998
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	4,562
Other (home visits)	1,535

C. Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2003-2004 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

Staff Information for Title I, A Targeted Assistance Programs 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	77.12
Teachers	818.03
Teacher Aides	842.87
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	48.0
Other (specify)	32.0

04/15/05

II. William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
(Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)

A. Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

For the 2003-2004 school year, please provide the following information:

1. Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

     a. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State   21 *
            (Indiana added three new sites in 2003.)*

2. Even Start Families Participating
   ("Participating" means participating in all applicable core services.)

     a. Total number of families served   648

     b. Total number of adults participating
       ("Adults" includes teen parents.)   675

     c. Total number of adults who are English language learners   80

     d. Total number of children participating   894

3. Characteristics of newly enrolled families <u>at the time of enrollment</u>
   (A newly enrolled family means a family who is enrolled for the first time in Even Start at any time during the year.)

     a. Number of newly enrolled families   480

     b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants   499

     c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the
       Federal Poverty level   89%

     d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a
       high school diploma or GED   79% *
          (Many of the ESL students have a diploma and*
           are <u>not</u> counted here, even though the diploma is not
           from an American high school.)

     e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have
       not gone beyond the 9th grade   35%

4. Percent of families that have remained in the program
(Include families that are newly enrolled and those that are continuing.)

a. From 0 to 3 months   25%

b. From 4 to 6 months   24%

c. From 7 to 12 months   25%

d. More than 12 months   26%

B. State Even Start Performance Indicators

Indiana Even Start Programs - Program Year 2003-2004

Total number of Programs Reporting = 18 (3 programs were start-ups this year and not included in this report.)

#	Performance Indicator	Standard	Measure	Results	Assessment of Progress '04	Explanation of Progress
1	**Recruitment**	A minimum of 15 families with 12 hours or more of participation are enrolled per site per quarter.	Sign-in sheets, Attendance forms, Participation Report	2001-2002: 50% of the programs met the standard. 2002-2003: 50% of the programs met the standard. 2003-2004: 56% of the programs met the standard.	Standard was not met in 2003-2004, but improvement was shown over the previous two years.	Program sites in largest population areas did meet the recruitment standard. Projects in smaller communities have a more difficult time recruiting.
2	**Retention in Program – Adults**	15% or more of the families with a minimum attendance of 75% remain in the program for 3 to 6 months.	Sign-in sheets, Attendance forms, Participation Report	2002-2003: 20% remained in the program for 3-6 months. 2003-2004: 22% remained in the program for 3 to 6 months.	Standard met for this part of the objective and improvement was shown between 2002-03 and 2003-04.	The performance objective was refined in 2002; therefore, no comparable data are available for the 2001-2002 program year. Retaining families in the program for long periods of time has proven challenging for the Indiana programs for several reasons: families move frequently, adults are pressured to get a job and then find it difficult to manage working and going to school, adults complete their GED and go on to employment or further schooling.
		35% or more of the families with a minimum attendance of 75% remain in the program for 6 to 12 months.		2002-2003: 29% remained in the program for 6-12 months. 2003-2004: 27% remained in the program for 6-12 months.	Standard not met for this part of the objective.	
		40% or more of the families with a minimum attendance of 75% remain in the program for 12 months or more.		2002-2003: 35% remained in the program for 12 months or more. 2003-2004: 28% remained in the program for 12 months or more.	Standard not met for this part of the objective.	

9

#	Performance Indicator	Standard	Measure	Results	Assessment of Progress '04	Explanation of Progress
3	**Retention in Program for Teens**	35% or more of teen parent families with a minimum attendance of 75% remain in the program for 3 to 6 months.	Sign-in sheets, Attendance forms, Participation Report	<u>2002-2003</u>: 18% remained in the program for 3 to 6 months <u>2003-2004</u>: 20% remained in the program for 3 to 6 months	Standard not met for this part of objective; however, improvement was shown between 2002-03 and 2003-04.	The performance objective was refined in 2002; therefore, no comparable data are available for the 2001-2002 program year.
		45% or more of teen parent families with a minimum attendance of 75% remain in the program for 6 to 12 months.		<u>2002-2003</u>: 36% remained in the program for 6 to 12 months <u>2003-2004</u>: 50% remained in the program for 6 to 12 months	Standard was met in 2003-2004 and significant improvement was made.	
		10% or more of teen parent families with a minimum attendance of 75% remain in the program for 12 months or more.		<u>2002-2003</u>: 36% remained in the program for 12 months or more. <u>2003-2004</u>: 20% remained in the program for 12 months or more.	Standard met for this part of objective.	

#	Performance Indicator	Standard	Measure	Results	Assessment of Progress '04	Explanation of Progress
4	**PreSchool-Age Children's Achievement**	75% or more of Even Start preschool children will demonstrate improved readiness for school reading and academic success in language and literacy.	COR, Work Sampling System, LAP-R/ELAP, Galileo System	<u>2001-2002</u>: 73% of the preschool children achieved the objective. <u>2002-2003</u>: 92% of the preschool children achieved the objective. <u>2003-2004</u>: 86% of the preschool children achieved the objective.	Standard met for the last two years.	Strong preschool programs are in place in most of the project sites. The preschools focus on the skills needed to prepare children to attend school.

04/15/05

| | | 75% or more of Even Start preschool children will demonstrate improved readiness for school reading and academic success in numeracy and concept development | | 2001-2002: 70% of the preschool children achieved the objective. 2002-2003: 91% of the preschool children achieved the objective. 2003-2004: 85% of the preschool children achieved the objective. | Standard met for the last two years. | |
| | | 75% or more of Even Start preschool children will demonstrate improved readiness for school reading and academic success in socialization and inter-personal skills. | | 2001-2002: 75% of the preschool children achieved the objective. 2002-2003: 95% of the preschool children achieved the objective. 2003-2004: 85% of the preschool children achieved the objective. | Standard met for all three years | |

11

#	Performance Indicator	Standard	Measure	Results	Assessment of Progress '04	Explanation of Progress
5	**School-Age Children's Achievement**	At least 90% of Even Start K-Grade 3 children will maintain at least a 95% school attendance rate.	Student attendance records	<u>2001-2002</u>: 82% of the school-age children achieved the objective. <u>2002-2003</u>: 78% of the school-age children achieved the objective. <u>2003-2004</u>: 70% of the school-age children achieved the objective.	Standard not met.	This is a difficult target to meet for families who face numerous crises, illnesses, and mobility.
		At least 90% of Even Start K-Grade 3 children will demonstrate improvement in ability to read on grade level or reading readiness.	School-Age Children's Achievement Form and classroom teacher's evaluation	<u>2002-2003</u>: 65% of the school-age children achieved the objective. <u>2003-2004</u>: 83% of the school-age children achieved the objective.	Standard not met but improvement shown.	Difficulty for children in the program to demonstrate reading ability on grade level or above when they have started so far behind their peers. Also, some of the children served are special needs.
		At least 90% of Even Start K-Grade 3 children will make continuous progress through grade 3 without being retained in grade.	Student promotion records	<u>2001-2002</u>: 86% of the school-age children achieved the objective. <u>2002-2003</u>: 96% of the school-age children achieved the objective. <u>2003-2004</u>: 96% of the school-age children achieved the objective.	Standard met in the past two years.	

04/15/05

| | | At least 90% of Even Start K-Grade 3 children will pass the 3rd grade ISTEP+ in English/language arts and math. | School-Age Children's Achievement Form and ISTEP+ records | 2001-2002: 22% of the school-age children achieved the objective. 2002-2003: 50% of the school-age children achieved the objective. 2003-2004: 35% of the school-age children achieved the objective. | Standard not met. | The numbers of children reported are quite small and the percentages fluctuate widely. |

#	Performance Indicator	Standard	Measure	Results	Assessment of Progress '04	Explanation of Progress
6	**Parent Involvement in Home and School**	80% of parents participate in at least 80% of parent-teacher conferences.	Attendance sheets, Parent Involvement in Home and School Form, PACT records	2003-2004: 96% of parents achieved the objective.	Standard met.	The performance objective was refined in 2003; therefore, no comparable data are available for the 2001-02 and 2002-03 program years.
		80% of parents participate in at least 80% of monthly home visits.		2003-2004: 94% of parents achieved the objective.	Standard met.	
		75% of parents extend literacy and learning activities into the home at least four times weekly.		2001-2002: 72% of the parents achieved the objective. 2002-2003: 85% of the parents achieved the objective. 2003-2004: 86% of the parents achieved the objective.	Standard met and continuous progress has been demonstrated.	
		80% of parents participate in a minimum of six family activities with a literacy or leaning focus.		2001-2002: 85% of the parents achieved the objective. 2002-2003: 83% of the parents achieved the objective. 2003-2004: 87% of the parents achieved the objective.	Standard met.	
7	**Parenting and PACT Services**	At least 10 parent-child interactive literacy activities are incorporated monthly.	Parent-Child Interactive Literacy Activity Record	2001-2002: 42% of the programs met the standard. 2002-2003: 93% of the programs met the standard. 2003-2004: 83% of the programs met the standard.	All of the programs did not meet the standard; however, significant improvement has been made from the 2001-02 year.	
8	**Parent Support Training Activities**	At least two parent support or training activities are held monthly.	Parent Support Training Activities Log	2001-2002: 42% of the programs met the standard. 2002-2003: 100% of the programs met the standard. 2003-2004: 83% of the programs met the standard.	All of the programs did not meet the standard; however, significant improvement has been made from the 2001-02 year.	

04/15/05

#	Performance Indicator	Target or Standard	Measure	Results	Assessment of Progress '04	Explanation of Progress
9	**Adult Achievement**	30% of all adult learners, who have completed at least 40 hours of adult education and who obtained a pre-test grade equivalent of 0-8.9 on the TABE or a scaled score of 200-220 on the CASAS in reading, mathematics, or language, will demonstrate a one level gain in reading, mathematics or language.	TABE and CASAS	2003-2004: 87% of the adult learners achieved the objective.	Standard met.	The performance objective was refined in 2003; therefore, no comparable data are available for the 2001-02 or 2002-03 program years.
		27% of all adult learners, who have completed at least 40 hours of ESL and who obtained a pre-test scaled score of 165-220 on the CASAS in reading, mathematics, or language, will demonstrate a one level gain in reading, mathematics, or language.	CASAS	2003-2004: 63% of the adult learners achieved the objective.	Standard met.	The performance objective was refined in 2003; therefore, no comparable data are available for the 2001-02 or 2002-03 program years.
10	**Adult Learner Attainment**	20% of adult learners with the goal of advanced education/training will enroll in post-secondary education or a job training/retraining program.	Adult Learner Results Form	2001-2002: 71% of the adult learners achieved the objective. 2002-2003: 129% of the adult learners achieved the objective. * 2003-2004: 69% of the adult learners achieved the objective.	Standard met.	* In 2002-03, 48 adult learners had a goal of advanced education and/or training, but 62 actually enrolled; hence, 129% success rate.
		20% of adults not employed at enrollment with the goal of employment will obtain unsubsidized employment.		2002-2003: 76% of the adult learners achieved the objective. 2003-2004: 71% of the adult learners achieved the objective.	Standard met.	Data not available for 2001-2002.

04/15/05

OMB NO. 1810-0614

| | | 34% of adults with a high school completion goal will earn a high school diploma or GED. | | 2001-2002: 60% of the adult learners achieved the objective. 2002-2003: 61% of the adult learners achieved the objective. 2003-2004: 74% of the adult learners achieved the objective. | Standard met and the results have shown steady improvement over the three years reported. | |

16

04/15/05

#	Performance Indicator	Standard	Measure	Results	Assessment of Progress '04	Explanation of Progress
11	**Adult Employability**	80% of Even Start parents who have improving computer skills as an employability goal will demonstrate at least a one level gain.	Computer Skills Competency Checklist	2001-2002: 91% of the parents achieved the objective. 2002-2003: 85% of the parents achieved the objective. 2003-2004: 92% of the parents achieved the objective.	Standard met.	
		80% of Even Start parents who have improving employability skills as a goal will document improved employment-related attitude, behaviors, and skills.	Employment Related Attitude Behavior Appraisal, Transferable Employability Skills Checklist	2001-2002: 64% of the parents achieved the objective. 2002-2003: 81% of the parents achieved the objective. 2003-2004: 83% of the parents achieved the objective.	Standard met.	
12	**Teen Parent Achievement**	Of teen parents participating in a secondary program, 65% will pass the ISTEP+ GQE in both English/language arts and math and/or receive a waiver in those areas.	ISTEP Results, High school records	2001-2002: 55% of the teen parents achieved this objective. 2002-2003: 67% of the teen parents achieved this objective. 2003-2004: 63% of the teen parents achieved this objective.	Standard not met.	These data are based on eleven, nine, and nineteen teen parents enrolled, respectively, in the years reported.
		Of teen parents participating in a secondary program, 75% who retest on the ISTEP+ GQE will increase their scores.	ISTEP Results, High school records	2001-2002: 100% of the teen parents achieved this objective. 2002-2003: 100% of the teen parents achieved this objective. 2003-2004: 50% of the teen parents achieved this objective.	Standard not met.	Results for 2003-04 were based on two students who were required to take the retest and only one increased her score.
		Of teen parents participating in a secondary program, 80% with a Grade 12 status in the fall of the year will earn a high school diploma during the school year.	High school graduation records	2001-2002: 100% of the teen parents achieved this objective. 2002-2003: 100% of the teen parents achieved this objective. 2003-2004: 89% of the teen parents achieved this objective.	Standard met.	Only three, four, and nine teen parents, in the respective years, had a Grade 12 status.

04/15/05

#	Performance Indicator	Standard	Measure	Results	Assessment of Progress '04	Explanation of Progress
13	**Collaboration**	The Even Start program holds coordination and advisory meetings with key collaborating programs at least four times during the program year.	Collaboration Report, Meeting Attendance Sheets and Minutes	2001-2002: 91% of the programs achieved the standard. 2002-2003: 86% of the programs achieved the standard. 2003-2004: 100% of the programs achieved the standard.	Standard met.	All programs convene advisory committees and attempt to meet on a quarterly basis. On average, the advisory boards meet six times a year.
		The Even Start program has at least ten non-LEA collaborating agencies making in-kind contributions to the program during the program year. If the minimum of ten is not met, the program can demonstrate an increase of at least two non-LEA collaborating agencies over the previous year.	Cumulative In-Kind Report	2002-2003: 92% of the programs achieved the standard. 2003-2004: 94% of the programs achieved the standard.	Standard met.	No reliable data were available for the 2001-02 year.
14	**Year-Round Services**	A minimum of 20 contact sessions were held with Even Start families during the summer.	Program records, Year-Round Services Report	2001-2002: 80% of the programs achieved the standard. 2002-2003: 86% of the programs achieved the standard. 2003-2004: 94% of the programs achieved the standard.	Standard met.	
		At least 75% of summer sessions focus on adult education, early childhood education and parenting/PACT objectives.	Program records, Lesson plans, Year-Round Services Report	2001-2002: 100% of the programs achieved the standard. 2002-2003: 100% of the programs achieved the standard. 2003-2004: 100% of the programs achieved the standard.	Standard met.	

04/15/05

C. Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

Indiana Even Start Programs - Program Year 2003-2004

Total number of Programs Reporting = 18 (3 programs were start-ups this year and not included in this report.)

Indicator	Target *Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data*	Measure *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	Cohort *Number of participants to whom the indicator applies*	Result *Number of participants who met the achievement goal*	Assessment of Progress *Status of progress on indicator* "Target met" or "Target not met"	Explanation of Progress *Description of why results were obtained or not*
A. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	52% advanced	TABE (Test of Adult Basic Education)	235 with 40 hours or more of instruction	160 **(68%)**	Target met.	In Indiana, our target is currently, 30% or more showing significant gains.
B. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of mathematics	60% advanced	TABE (Test of Adult Basic Education)	263 with 40 hours or more of instruction	203 **(77%)**	Target met.	In Indiana, our target is currently, 30% or more showing significant gains.
C. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition	62% advanced	CASAS (Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System)	75 with 40 hours or more of instruction	47 **(63%)**	Target met.	In Indiana, our target is currently, 27% or more showing significant gains.

04/15/05

D. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	100% received a diploma	Evidence of receiving a diploma or passing the GED exam	9 who had Grade 12 status	Diploma: 8 **(89%)**	Target met.	In Indiana, our target is currently, 80% or more showing significant gains.
E. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	61% earned a GED or diploma	Evidence of receiving a diploma or passing the GED exam	107 who are potentially able	Diploma: 9 GED: 70 **(74%)**	Target met.	In Indiana, our target is currently, 34% of adults who are potentially able * to complete a GED or diploma will do so. *(* Potentially able means that they are close enough in their adult education program to make it an achievable goal during the year.)*

20

Indicator	Target *Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data*	Measure *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	Cohort *Number of participants who have this goal*	Result *Number and percentage of participants who met this goal*	Assessment of Progress *Status of progress on indicator (1)Target met (2)Target not met*	Explanation of Progress *Description of why results were obtained*
F. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development	92% made significant gains	COR, LAP/R/ELAP, or Galileo	264 were enrolled for six months or more <u>and</u> pre/post tested	228 **(86%)**	Target met.	In Indiana, our target is currently, 75% or more showing significant gains.
G. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of reading readiness	92% made significant gains	COR, LAP/R/ELAP, or Galileo	264 were enrolled for six months or more <u>and</u> pre/post tested	228 **(86%)**	Target met.	In Indiana, our target is currently, 75% or more showing significant gains.

| H. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level | 65% | End-of-year grade level reading text expectancies administered by classroom teacher | 109 children in Grades K-3 | 91

(83%) | Target not met. | In Indiana, our target is currently, 90% or more showing significant gains.

Even Start programs are working with families who have a higher occurrence of special needs children and academically delayed students. Even though they make more than a year's growth , they may not be on grade level. |

04/15/05

Indicator	Target *Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data*	Measure *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	Cohort *Number of participants who have this goal*	Result *Number and percentage of participants who met this goal*	Assessment of Progress *Status of progress on indicator (1)Target met (2)Target not met*	Explanation of Progress *Description of why results were obtained*
I. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities	92%	Teacher records of participation in parent-teacher conferences and home visits	266 parents enrolled for six months or more	249 **(94%)**	Target met.	In Indiana, our target is currently, 80% or more parents will participate in 80% or more of the teacher conferences and home visits.
	85%	Program records such as monthly family calendars or reading logs documenting literacy and learning activities in the home through reading, homework support, and/or interactive learning activities	263 parents enrolled for six months or more	226 **(86%)**	Target met.	In Indiana, our target is currently, 75% or more parents will extend literacy and learning through reading, homework support, and/or interactive learning activities at least four times weekly.

04/15/05

	83%	Program records such as attendance logs or monthly family calendars documenting participation in family activities with a learning focus, such as going to the library or field trips	263 parents enrolled for six months or more	230 **(87%)**	Target met.	In Indiana, our target is currently, 80% or more parents will participate in a minimum of six family activities with a learning focus such as going to the library or field trips.

04/15/05

III. Education of Migratory Children
(Title I, Part C)

Please complete the following tables for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program.

General Data Reporting Information

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2003-2004.

2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE I. POPULATION DATA

Table I requires you to report the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2003-2004 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 – 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
A. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	1093	1228	429	547	528	518	534	467	518	524	473	498	482	344	316	6	1435	9950
B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"			242	253	268	246	258	236	259	277	231	248	239	181	154	6		3098
C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)																		
1. Migrant Children that are LEP		89	203	324	297	306	311	318	338	283	236	220	173	141	99	---	1131	4469

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATON																		
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	---	---	2	1	5	7	11	5	4	6	--	8	2	--	--	6	--	57
E. MOBILITY																		
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	578	689	242	253	268	246	258	236	259	277	231	248	239	181	154	6	733	5098
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	356	389	149	151	148	153	164	146	155	149	136	143	139	103	92	--	464	3037
3. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	133	146	36	111	94	99	87	74	88	77	79	82	73	51	49	--	209	1488
4. Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months; counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	---	---	372	469	462	456	468	432	429	441	429	443	421	306	294	6	---	5428

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS

Table II asks for the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2003-2004 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
F. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION -- (Note: Data on the high school completion <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.) *** NOT collected for 2003-04**																		
1. *Dropped out of school*										-	-	-	-	-	-	-		**-***
2. Obtained GED																		**-***
G. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT -- (Note: The results of state assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts are collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report. However, information on the number of eligible migrant students who participated in the state assessment will be collected below.) **GRADES TESTED= 3,6,8,10.**																		
1. Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment – Reading/Language Arts)						206	-	-	209	-	189		136	-	-	-		740
2. Number of Migrant Students Tested in Reading/Language Arts (State Assessment)						64	-	-	76	-	73		40	-	-	-		253
3. Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment – Mathematics)						206	-	-	209	-	189		136	-	-	-		740
4. Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State Assessment)						64	-	-	76	-	73		40	-	-	-		253

04/15/05

INSTRUCTION: TABLE III. H. MEP PARTICIPATION – REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR

Table III H. asks for the statewide, *unduplicated* number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2003-2004 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. DO NOT count migrant children served through a <u>schoolwide</u> program (SWP) where MEP funds were combined, in <u>any</u> row of this table.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

<u>Served in a Regular School Year Project</u>. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a "referred" service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services.   In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) – (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the regular school year.

<u>Instructional Services</u>.   For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received <u>any</u> type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

<u>Support Services</u>. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received <u>any</u> type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

<u>Referred Services</u>. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds. (Do not count the number of service interventions per child).

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
H. PARTICIPATION—<u>REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR</u>																		
1. Served in MEP (with an MEP-funded Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in a SWP where MEP funds are combined)	473	919	396	481	458	461	452	446	431	443	384	422	415	359	267	6	1297	8110
2. Priority for Service			219	223	211	213	247	221	217	219	208	224	212	167	118	6		2705
3. Continuation of Service		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--*
4. Any Instructional Service	--	23	396	481	458	461	452	446	431	443	384	422	415	359	267	6	587	6031
5. Reading Instruction	--	23	396	481	458	461	452	446	431	443	384	422	415	359	267	6	587	6031
6. Mathematics Instruction	--	23	396	481	458	461	452	446	431	443	384	422	415	359	267	6	587	6031
7. High School Credit Accrual												47	39	42	38	---	---	166
8. Any Support Service	273	616	206	291	264	276	233	226	285	310	298	296	261	223	165	6	864	5093
9. Counseling Service	--	--	4	15	19	12	26	15	32	37	30	25	24	16	11	4	---	270
10. Any Referred Service	96	473	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	11	14	10	13	16	--	--	633

*NOT COLLECTED IN 2003-04

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE III. I. MEP PARTICIPATION –SUMMER/INTERSESSION TERM

Table III I. asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP funded service, even children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Summer or Intersession Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a "referred" service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services.   In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) – (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the summer term.

Instructional Services.   For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds (i.e., do not count the number of service interventions per child).

04/15/05

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
I. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION																		
1. Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	618	797	432	406	439	411	403	392	412	405	387	374	306	294	248	6	1399	7729
2. Priority for Service			217	223	228	207	216	202	219	241	193	195	189	159	117	6		2612
3. Continuation of Service		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---*
4. Any Instructional Service	--	--	432	406	439	411	403	392	412	405	387	374	306	294	248	6	317	5232
5. Reading Instruction	--	--	432	406	439	411	403	392	412	405	387	374	306	294	248	6	317	5232
6. Mathematics Instruction	--	--	432	406	439	411	403	392	412	405	387	374	306	294	248	6	317	5232
7. High School Credit Accrual												21	14	10	2	---	---	47
8. Any Support Service	312	576	150	291	246	271	291	254	297	271	251	302	203	174	136	6	875	4906
9. Counseling Service	--	--	--	12	11	8	6	7	9	8	9	7	11	9	14	6	---	117
10. Any Referred Service	102	598	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	16	15	21	19	--	--	771

*NOT COLLECTED IN 2003-04

04/15/05

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA

Table IV asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in those schools.

In the first column of Table IV, enter the number of <u>schools</u> that enroll *eligible* migrant children during the regular school year. Schools include public schools, alternative schools, and private schools (that serve school-age children, i.e., grades K-12). In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide.

TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA		
J. STUDENT ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 278	b. 16,483
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 10	b. 634

04/15/05

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. K. MEP PROJECT DATA – TYPE OF MEP PROJECT

Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds (by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant) and provides services directly to the migrant child. DO NOT include *schoolwide* programs in which MEP were combined in any row of this table.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA		
K. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT	NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (All MEP Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 20	b. 4909
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All MEP Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a. 1	b. 168
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 1	b. 97
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (All MEP Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 12	b. 5427

33

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. L. MEP PROJECT DATA – KEY MEP PERSONNEL

For each school term, enter both the actual number and *full-time-equivalent* number of staff that are paid by the MEP. Report both the actual number and FTE number by job classification. For <u>actual</u> numbers, enter the total number of individuals who were employed in the appropriate job classification, regardless of the percentage of time the person was employed. For the <u>FTE</u> number, define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. (For example, one regular term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days, one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) Use only the percentage of an FTE paid by the MEP in calculating the total FTE numbers to be reported below for each job classification.

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs where MEP funds are combined with those of other programs.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA				
L. KEY MEP PERSONNEL	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR	FTE IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR 1 FTE = _180_____ Days	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION	FTE IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION 1 FTE = __30____ Days
1. State Director	a. 1.0	b. 1.0	c. 1.0	d. 1.0
2. Teachers	a. 49.0	b. 38.0	c. 96.0	d. 2.0
3. Counselors	a. 11.0	b. 3.5	c. 7.0	d. 4.5
4. All Paraprofessionals	a. 113.0	b. 98.5	c. 114.0	d. 106.0
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	a. 78.0	b. 76.0	c. 86.0	d. 84.0
6. Recruiters	a. 11.0	b. 8.0	c. 37.0	d. 21.0
7. Records Transfer Staff	a. 24.0	b. 18.0	c. 20.0	d. 14.0

04/15/05

IV. Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)

A. Student Participation n Title I, Part D by Racial/Ethnic Groups and Gender

In the following table, please provide the unduplicated number of children participating in Title I, Part D by racial/ethnic groups and gender during the 2003-2004 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, D by Racial or Ethnic Group 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Students
American Indian/Alaskan Native	7
Asian/Pacific Islander	33
Black, non-Hispanic	308
Hispanic	3,292
White, non-Hispanic	5,688
*Multiracial (added by IDE)	111

*Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Student Participation in Title I, D by Gender 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Students
Male	6,750
Female	2,689

B. Program Results

The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2004-2005 school year. These data will be available for the first time for the 2004-2005 school year and will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report that will cover the results of school year 2004-2005 activities.

V. Comprehensive School Reform
(Title I, Part F)

A. Please provide the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in reading/language arts based on data from the 2003-2004 school year. <u>78.9%*</u>

B. Please provide the percentage of CSR schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in mathematics based on data from the 2003-2004 school year. <u>80.7%*</u>

C. How many schools in the State have or have been awarded a CSR grant since 1998? <u>59</u>

*% based on 57 schools with data, 2 without data

<div style="border:1px solid black; background:#d9d9d9; text-align:center;">

**VII. Enhancing Education through Technology
(Title II, Part D)**

</div>

Funding Year: FY 2002
School Years: 2002 – 2003 AND 2003 – 2004

FY 2002 Program Information
State (Approved) Technology Plan (YES/NO) NO Year last updated:__1998_____ Date of State Approval: _____1998_____ Web Site Location/URL: www.doe.state.in.us/olr

State Program Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its EETT performance indicators based on data sources that the State established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement, as submitted in the Consolidated State Application. Indicate which of the three or combination of the three Title II, Part D goals relates to your State goals.

Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology Goals:
1. Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools.
2. To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.
3. To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.

Provide results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

For the purpose of completing the table below, please explain how you define the following:

1. **Curriculum Integration -**The use of technology in redesigned curriculum in ways that add value to student learning.

2. **Technology literacy** - is the ability to responsibly use appropriate technology to communicate, solve problems, and access, manage, integrate, evaluate, and create information to improve learning in all subject areas and to acquire lifelong knowledge and skills in the 21st century (SETDA, 2003).

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	Increase student academic achievement through the use of technology. (Technology is not an add-on in Indiana schools. Technology and information literacy are embedded in the Indiana Academic Standards in grades 2-12.)
Statutory Goal **Indicate Statutory** **Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3.** **This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.**	1. Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools. 2. To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability. 3. To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.
Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)	The SEA's strategies for improving technology literacy will be based on the vision statement for the SEA technology plan: "Communities of learners are engaged in lifelong learning and are contributing members of the global and digital information world--learners who have problem-solving and higher-order critical thinking skills, information and communication skills, access to current and real- world information and tools, and mastery of core basic skills."
Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)	• Target specific academic needs as determined by student performance on the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress–Plus (ISTEP+); • Identify and set goals for improved student performance in mathematics, language arts, and/or science based on the school improvement plan; • Discuss the provisions that will be made to ensure collaboration between teachers, parents, students, and community members for improved teaching and learning through technology; • Explain how Ed Tech Grant Program funds will be utilized to target student achievement of the Indiana Academic Standards in low-income and low-performing schools in their school system; and • Describe how Ed Tech Grant Program funds will be coordinated with other funding sources.

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
Target *Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).* ***BASELINE DATA***	Pilot projects in planning stages. Work with *all* eligible LEAs to establish intervention project parameters for scaling and replication for a fall 2003 implementation. Ensure project aligns with and supports school improvement plan, provides leadership at building and district level, and provides summer professional development and training, and technical assistance to begin implementation in the fall. Model of implementation: **Year 1** - project is up and running by beginning of school year Student and teacher data is submitted Nov, April and June each year **Year 2** – same requirements as Year 1, additionally: • Project must demonstrate student achievement gains with intervention population • Project must be scaled vertically or horizontally • All project teams must present at regional, state and/or national conferences **Year 3** – same requirement as Year 1 & 2, additionally: • LEA must provide electronic dissemination (website) of results to data with supporting templates, lessons, professional development strategies and documents to allow other LEAs to replicate project. **Year 4 –** same requirement as Year 1, 2 & 3, additionally: • LEA must serve as an outreach site for other LEAs to visit (virtually or face-to-face) and begin replication of the project. **Year 5 –** same requirement as Year 1, 2, 3 & 4, additionally: • LEA must serve as a mentor (both virtually or face-to-face) for other LEAs to begin replication of the project.
Target *Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year*	**Year 1 Target**: 15 LEAs to participate in proof-of-concept project model. Projects must target student achievement area outlined in school improvement plan, be replicable, scalable, and provide community outreach components. Intervention schools must submit large-scale objective student achievement data 3 times per year. Teacher technology integration data submitted twice per year. 19 LEAs chosen to initiate proof-of-concept projects that target E/LA, math science and ESL
Target *Set target for 2004-05 school year.*	**Year 1**: Five (5) LEAs began a pilot project **Year 2:** 18 Year-1 LEAs continued to Year-2 status. (1 LEA discontinued to due to LEA student redistricting that made scalability infeasible.) TOTAL 23 LEAs
Target *Set target for 2005-06 school year*	**Year 1:** Five (5) LEAs began a Year-1 program **Year 2**: Five (5) LEAs continued to Year-2 status. **Year 3:** 18 Year -2 LEAs continued to Year-3 status. TOTAL 28 LEAs
Target *Set target for 2006-07 school year.*	**Year 1:** Five (5) LEAs began a Year-1 program **Year 2**: Five (5) LEAs continued to Year-2 status.

04/15/05

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	Year 3: Five (5) LEAs continued to Year-3 status. **Year 4:** 18 Year -2 LEAs continued to Year-4 status. TOTAL 33 LEAs

Target
Set target for 2007-08 school
	Year 1: Five (5) LEAs began a Year-1 program
	    10 additional sites choose to participate in mentee role
	    without EETT funding
	Year 2: Five (5) LEAs continued to Year-2 status.
	Year 3: Five (5) LEAs continued to Year-3 status.
	Year 4: Five (5) LEAs continued to Year-4 status.
	Year 5: 18 Year -2 LEAs continued to Year-4 status.
	
	TOTAL 38 LEAs (plus 10 additional mentee sites)

Assessment of Progress *Status of progress on indicator* *(1) Target met* *(2) Target not met*	2002-03 - *(1) Target met* 2003-04 - *(1) Target met* 2004-05 – still in progress

Measurement tool(s) used
to assess progress of indicators.
	• Three (3) reports per year (fall, winter and spring) that include:
	    o Large-scale objective assessment data (ISTEP+ used in conjunction with NWEA, Terra Nova or other locally chosen SEA approved assessment instrument);
	    o Teacher integration assessment data (2 times per year);
	    o Narrative of project trends, patterns and adjustments needed.
	• Two (2) site visits conducted yearly to provide technical assistance, assess student achievement intervention and professional development needs, leadership capacity and overall project status to date;
	• Two (2) program meetings (1 business/technical assistance, 1 presentations of each proof-of-concept project), and;
	• Yearly evaluation report filed by outside evaluator.

Explanation for not making progress - *Description of why target(s) was not met for SY 03-04, and steps that will taken to ensure progress.*	

If for any reason you have modified or added Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets since submitting the State Consolidated Application, please indicate in the chart below.

Original Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	Modification or Additions
Title II, Part D goal was implied but not stated on State Consolidated Application	Increase student academic achievement through the use of technology.

Model of implementation was not outlined on State Consolidated Application	Model of implementation:
	Year 1 - project is up and running by beginning of school year
	Student and teacher data is submitted Nov, April and June each year
	Year 2 – same requirements as Year 1, additionally:
	  • Project must demonstrate student achievement gains with intervention population
	  • Project must be scaled vertically or horizontally
	  • All project teams must present at regional, state and/or national conferences
	Year 3 – same requirement as Year 1 & 2, additionally:
	  • LEA must provide electronic dissemination (website) of results to data with supporting templates, lessons, professional development strategies and documents to allow other LEAs to replicate project.
	Year 4 – same requirement as Year 1, 2 & 3, additionally:
	  • LEA must serve as an outreach site for other LEAs to visit (virtually or face-to-face) and begin replication of the project.
	Year 5 – same requirement as Year 1, 2, 3 & 4, additionally:
	  • LEA must serve as an mentor (both virtually or face-to-face) for other LEAs to begin replication of the project.

<div style="text-align: center; border: 1px solid black;">

IX. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act
(Title IV, Part A)

</div>

A. Performance Measures

Instructions: In the following chart, please identify:

- Each of your State indicators as submitted in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application;
- The instrument or data source used to measure the indicator;
- The frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection;
- The baseline data and year the baseline was established; and
- Targets for the years in which your State has established targets.

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets		Actual Performance	
Decrease the number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the state.	DOE-EX Report	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2003-2004	2002-2003	0	2002-2003	0
			2003-2004	0	2003-2004	0
			2004-2005	0		
			2005-2006	0	Baseline: 0 Year established: 02-03	
			2006-2007	0		
			2007-2008	0		
Decrease the number of expulsions for possession of deadly weapons (Other than firearms)	DOE-EX Report	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2003-2004	2002-2003	1246	2002-2003	1,246
			2003-2004	1221	2003-2004	256
			2004-2005	1196		
			2005-2006	1172	Baseline: 1,246 Year established: 02-03	
			2006-2007	1149		
			2007-2008	1126		
Decrease the number of suspensions and expulsions for the use/possession of alcohol and tobacco	DOE-EX and DOE-SU Reports	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2003-2004	2002-2003	18,115	2002-2003	18,115
			2003-2004	17,753	2003-2004	4,565
			2004-2005	17,398		
			2005-2006	17,051	Baseline: 18,115 Year established:02-03	
			2006-2007	16,710		
			2007-2008	16,376		
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 8 reporting the use of alcohol in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	24.3%	2002-2003	24.3%
			2003-2004	23.5%	2003-2004	23.5%
			2004-2005	22.8%		
			2005-2006	22.1%	Baseline: 24.3% Year established: 02-03	
			2006-2007	21.3%		
			2007-2008	20.5%		
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 8 reporting the use of tobacco in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	14.0%	2002-2003	14.0%
			2003-2004	13.4%	2003-2004	13.4
			2004-2005	12.5%		
			2005-2006	11.6%	Baseline: 14.0% Year established:02-03	
			2006-2007	10.7%		
			2007-2008	9.8%		

04/15/05

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets		Actual Performance	
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 8 reporting the use of marijuana in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	10.6%	2002-2003	10.6%
			2003-2004	9.8%	2003-2004	9.8%
			2004-2005	9.4%	Baseline: 10.6% Year established:02-03	
			2005-2006	9.1%		
			2006-2007	8.7%		
			2007-2008	8.3%		
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 10 reporting the use of alcohol in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	36.9%	2002-2003	36.9%
			2003-2004	34.1%	2003-2004	34%
			2004-2005	33.1%	Baseline: 36.9% Year established: 02-03	
			2005-2006	32.1%		
			2006-2007	31.1%		
			2007-2008	30.1%		
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 10 reporting the use of tobacco in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	22.2%	2002-2003	22.2%
			2003-2004	22.1%	2003-2004	22.1
			2004-2005	20.4%	Baseline: 22.2% Year established: 02-03	
			2005-2006	18.7%		
			2006-2007	17.0%		
			2007-2008	15.3%		
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 10 reporting the use of marijuana in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	18.2%	2002-2003	18.2%
			2003-2004	17.2%	2003-2004	17.2
			2004-2005	16.8%	Baseline: 18.2% Year established: 02-03	
			2005-2006	16.3%		
			2006-2007	15.9%		
			2007-2008	15.5%		
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 12 reporting the use of alcohol in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	46.1%	2002-2003	46.1%
			2003-2004	42.2%	2003-2004	42.3%
			2004-2005	40.2%	Baseline: 46.1% Year established: 02-03	
			2005-2006	39.3%		
			2006-2007	36.3%		
			2007-2008	34.5%		
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 12 reporting the use of tobacco in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year:	2002-2003	28.8%	2002-2003	28.8%
			2003-2004	27.4%	2003-2004	27.4%
			2004-2005	24.5%		

04/15/05

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets		Actual Performance
	Survey	2004	2005-2006	21.7%	Baseline: 28.8% Year established: 02-03
			2006-2007	18.8%	
			2007-2008	15.8%	
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 12 reporting the use of marijuana in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	19.8%	2002-2003 19.8%
			2003-2004	18.3%	2003-2004 18.2%
			2004-2005	17.2%	
			2005-2006	16.1%	Baseline: 19.8% Year established: 02-03
			2006-2007	15.0%	
			2007-2008	13.5%	
Increase the percentage of students in grade 8 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke one or more packs of cigarettes a day.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	79.1%	2002-2003 79.1%
			2003-2004	79.7%	2003-2004 79%
			2004-2005	80.3%	
			2005-2006	80.9%	Baseline: 79.1% Year established: 02-03
			2006-2007	81.5%	
			2007-2008	82.1%	
Increase the percentage of students in grade 8 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke marijuana occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	69%	2002-2003 69%
			2003-2004	70.2%	2003-2004 70.2%
			2004-2005	71.4%	
			2005-2006	72.6%	Baseline: 69% Year established: 02-03
			2006-2007	73.8%	
			2007-2008	63%	
Increase the percentage of students in grade 8 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they take one or more drinks of alcohol (beer, wine liquor occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	28.8%	2002-2003 28.8%
			2003-2004	29.6%	2003-2004 29.6%
			2004-2005	30.4%	
			2005-2006	31.2%	Baseline: 28.8% Year established:
			2006-2007	32%	
			2007-2008	32.8%	
Increase the percentage of students in grade 10 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke one or more packs of cigarettes a day.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	84.2%	2002-2003 84.2%
			2003-2004	84.5%	2003-2004 84.5%
			2004-2005	85.9%	
			2005-2006	87.3%	Baseline: 84.2% Year established: 02-03
			2006-2007	88.7%	
			2007-2008	90.1%	

04/15/05

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets		Actual Performance	
Increase the percentage of students in grade 10 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke marijuana occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	57.4%	2002-2003	57.4%
			2003-2004	59.3%	2003-2004	59.3%
			2004-2005	59.9%		
			2005-2006	60.5%	Baseline: 57.4% Year established: 02-03	
			2006-2007	61.0%		
			2007-2008	61.5%		
Increase the percentage of students in grade 10 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they take one or more drinks of alcohol (beer, wine liquor occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	24.1%	2002-2003	24.1%
			2003-2004	26.0%	2003-2004	26%
			2004-2005	25.7%		
			2005-2006	25.4%	Baseline: 24.1% Year established: 02-03	
			2006-2007	25.1%		
			2007-2008	24.8%		
Increase the percentage of students in grade 12 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke one or more packs of cigarettes a day.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	85.9%	2002-2003	85.9%
			2003-2004	85.9%	2003-2004	85.9%
			2004-2005	86.8%		
			2005-2006	87.6%	Baseline: 85.9% Year established: 02-03	
			2006-2007	88.5%		
			2007-2008	89.4%		
Increase the percentage of students in grade 12 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke marijuana occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	51.9%	2002-2003	51.9%
			2003-2004	53.3%	2003-2004	53.3%
			2004-2005	53.6%		
			2005-2006	54.0%	Baseline: 51.9% Year established: 02-03	
			2006-2007	54.3%		
			2007-2008	54.6%		
Increase the percentage of students in grade 12 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they take one or more drinks of alcohol (beer, wine liquor occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	2002-2003	19.3%	2002-2003	19.3%
			2003-2004	21.2%	2003-2004	21.2%
			2004-2005	21.8%		
			2005-2006	22.3%	Baseline: 19.3% Year established:	
			2006-2007	22.9%		
			2007-2008	23.5%		

04/15/05

B. Suspension and Expulsion Data

Instructions: In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students for each of the underlined incidents.

Please also provide the State's definition of an elementary, middle, and high school, as well as the State's definition of each of the incidents underlined below.

(If your State does not collect data in the same format as requested by this form, the State may provide data from a similar question, provided the State includes a footnote explaining the differences between the data requested and the data the State is able to supply.)

School Type	State Definition
Elementary	Schools Consisting of grades PK, KG, 01-06, 01-05, 02-04, 02-06, 03-05, 04-06
Elementary & Jr. High	Schools Consisting of grades PK-08, KG-08, KG-07, KG-09, 05-08, 06-08,06-09
Elementary & High School	Schools Consisting of grades PK-12, KG-12, 02-11, 06-11, 06-12
Jr. High	Schools Consisting of grades 07-07, 07-09, 07-08, 08-08, 09-09
Jr. High & High School	Schools Consisting of grades 7-12, 08-12, 08-10
High School	Schools Consisting of grades 9-12, 10-12, 11-12

1. **The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting.**

State definition of physical fighting: *Did not begin collecting data under this category until the 2004-2005 school year.*

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	NA	293
Elementary & Jr. High	NA	293
Elementary & High School	NA	293
Jr. High	NA	293
Jr. High & High School	NA	293
High School	NA	293

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	NA	293
Elementary & Jr. High	NA	293
Elementary & High School	NA	293
Jr. High	NA	293
Jr. High & High School	NA	293
High School	NA	293

04/15/05

2. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for <u>weapons</u> possession

State definition of <u>weapons</u>: *All data are reported based on local school district discipline codes and are reported under the category of "deadly weapons (other than firearms)" and under the categories of handguns, rifles or shotguns and other firearms as defined by U.S. Code*

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	497	293
Elementary & Jr. High	233	293
Elementary & High School	19	293
Jr. High	109	293
Jr. High & High School	58	293
High School	232	293

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	36	293
Elementary & Jr. High	71	293
Elementary & High School	3	293
Jr. High	37	293
Jr. High & High School	14	293
High School	119	293

3. The number of <u>alcohol-related</u> out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

State definition of <u>alcohol-related</u>: *All data are reported based on local school district discipline codes.*

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	27	293
Elementary & Jr. High	103	293
Elementary & High School	3	293
Jr. High	81	293
Jr. High & High School	56	293
High School	397	293

04/15/05

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	1	293
Elementary & Jr. High	18	293
Elementary & High School	3	293
Jr. High	11	293
Jr. High & High School	14	293
High School	129	293

4. The number of <u>illicit drug-related</u> out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

State definition of <u>illicit-drug related</u>: *All data are reported based on local school district discipline codes and are reported under the category "drugs" which would be any suspension/expulsion for a drug other than alcohol or tobacco.*

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	91	293
Elementary & Jr. High	598	293
Elementary & High School	53	293
Jr. High	256	293
Jr. High & High School	194	293
High School	1420	293

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	12	293
Elementary & Jr. High	273	293
Elementary & High School	117	293
Jr. High	157	293
Jr. High & High School	100	293
High School	801	293

C. Parent Involvement

<u>Instructions:</u> Section 4116 of the No Child Left Behind Act requires that each State provide information pertaining to the State's efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts. Please describe your State's efforts to include parents in these activities.

The state of Indiana has worked to ensure that parents are both informed and included in the drug and violence prevention efforts coordinated through the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program. Both the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) and

the Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA), which oversees the Governor's portion of the SDFSC funding, have included parents through various state-level efforts.

The Indiana Department of Education has organized a state Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Council. Included in the membership of the council is a parent representative. Through this involvement the parent member has had the opportunity to gain greater knowledge and provide input into the drug and violence prevention efforts of IDOE. Also, in an effort to connect parents to prevention in Indiana the IDOE has developed a web page specifically for parents related to Safe and Drug-Free Schools. The web site provides information useful to parents in their role as prevention partners. It also can be used as a vehicle to inform parents of current drug and violence prevention efforts conducted by IDOE.

Through the efforts of the Division of Mental Health and Addiction parents have had the opportunity to participate in the development of a prevention framework for the state. For more than three years, hundreds of Indiana residents working in dozens of task groups have developed the "Framework" to guide the state's prevention efforts in the early 21st Century. The effort was driven by a desire to empower individuals, families, neighborhoods, and grassroots organizations to increase their control over alcohol, tobacco, and other drug problems in their own environments. DMHA also convenes the Governor's Addiction Planning Council which includes a Prevention Committee. The membership of the Addiction Planning Council includes a parent representative who provides a connection to a perspective that is both valuable and necessary.

In addition, other State agencies collaborated with DOE and DMHA to provide training for a workforce that directly serves families at risk for substance abuse and domestic violence.

Finally, Community Consultants were trained to work with volunteers and disseminated local information on crime and violence. Soon the Community Consultants will complete a train-the-trainer model, Pathways, and will teach volunteers in Local Coordinating Councils how to gather their own local data to improve their Comprehensive County Plans for treatment services, prevention and law enforcement. Together, they will make safer environments for schools and communities.

XI. Innovative Programs
(Title V, Part A)

A. Please describe **major** results to date of State-level Title V, Part A funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students. Please use quantitative data if available (e.g., increases in the number of highly qualified teachers).

Title V, Part A state funds support activities that are designed to improve student learning and to improve instruction in the classrooms. Three programs, supported by Title V, are briefly discussed to illustrate the spectrum of activities that would not otherwise be available in our State.

(1) Using Criterion (a web-based service that evaluates a student's writing skills and provides instant score reporting and diagnostic feedback to both the instructor and student) this year, 8,665 English 11 students have submitted 42,420 essays; 33,889 10th graders have submitted 160,341 essays; 5,582 9th graders have submitted 28,856 essays.   Students and teachers report that students are motivated to write when they can use computers and receive immediate feedback about their writing. Research shows that the more frequently a student writes with feedback, the more a student's writing improves. We believe that student writing achievement will improve with the use of this online writing evaluation program.

(2) The Policy Analyst works closely with the Chief State School Officer, the Indiana State Board of Education, Indiana Department of Education staff, and Indiana legislators to provide analysis of education research and education related policies of other states. For any given issue, whether it be closing the achievement gap or teacher quality, for example, the Policy Analyst collects and reviews research materials for quality (is the research scientifically based?), content, and results to provide recommendations for action. The Policy Analyst also conducts surveys of both local school staff and state education staff to provide background information for policy decisions related to graduation requirements, assessment issues, teacher recruitment and retention issues, and other policy issues as needed. The Policy Analyst also serves as a resource for educators, parents, and legislators to help guide them to pertinent research resources and to provide school performance data and/or interpretation of data.

(3) ASAP Website
   The Indiana Department of Education's ASAP (Accountability System for Academic Progress) Website is an interactive tool that assists school communities in making informed decisions concerning student achievement and school performance. The site merges state and NCLB requirements, academic standards, instructional resources and a wide range of demographic and assessment data into an interface that is easy to use and completely accessible to the public.

- The website provides the general public with reliable, easy to understand information about student achievement and school performance.

- It also provides educators with a user-friendly method of accessing information that can be useful in meeting the requirements of Indiana's accountability system.

- The vast amount of statewide school data has been conveniently organized and visually displayed to provide the user with multiple methods of analysis and comparison.

- Through the use of data, schools will be able to make informed decisions about educational programming.

- Easy access to the Indiana academic standards provides opportunities for teachers to align what is expected for Indiana students with local curriculum and instruction.

- The website is also designed to assist school communities with their school improvement planning process by providing links to "best practice" ideas and resources that have been developed both in Indiana and nationally.

Key Points

- Cost-Effective – Other states have had to spend large sums of money to develop what Indiana has been able to design from within the IDOE.
- High Level of Data Access – The general public now has more access to Indiana state and school level data than what most states offer.
- Connection to School Improvement – Many websites focus solely on reporting data. The ASAP website includes the ability to view the data and find resources for improvement.
- User-Friendly Interface – All members of the general public that are interested in education can find reliable information in an easy-to-use Q & A format.
- Time Saving Tool – Care was taken in the design of the site in order to provide the user with specific information that can be reached in a minimum amount of clicks.
- This site is constantly updated with new data and resources as they become available. Useful suggestions from the field are incorporated into the overall site to ensure that the information presented continues to be useful, reliable and relevant.

B. The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including**: **(1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2003-2004 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area[1]	Number of LEAs that used **20%** or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for:	Number of these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: **Student Achievement in Reading and Math**	234	234	896,835
Area 2: **Teacher Quality**	88	88	292,589
Area 3: **Safe and Drug Free Schools**	6	6	6,842
Area 4: **Increase Access for all Students**	54	54	38,142

Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b).

B.1 Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2003-2004, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above. _____3_____

B.2 Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2003-2004. _____3_____

---

[1] In completing this table, States should include activities described in Section 5131 of the ESEA as follows: Area 1 (activities 3, 9,12,16,19,20,22,26,27), Area 2 (activity 1,2), Area 3 (activity 14,25), Area 4 (activities 4,5,7,8,15,17)

04/15/05

XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP)
(Title VI, Part B)

A. Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2003-2004 school year. _____**1**_____

B. Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)

1. LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2003-2004 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	**1**
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	**1**
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	
Parental involvement activities	
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	

2. Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

Goal One: By 2013 – 2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Exhibit One: School Corporation % Passing

RLIS School Corporation	English/Language Arts			Mathematics		
	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004
Barr-Reeve School Corp.	72.4	81.4	79.2	75.9	90.3	87.4

Note: ISTEP+ Data from school years 1998-1999 through 2003-2004, by school corporation by language arts and math can also be located at: www.asap.state.in.us/data.html.

Goal Two: School dropout rates will decrease by ½ percent during the life of the program.

Exhibit Two: Number of dropouts by school corporation from school years 1999-2000 through 2003–2004.

RLIS School Corporation: Barr-Reeve School Corporation

	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04
Number of Dropouts	**11**	**10**	**11**	**15**	**4**

Goal Three: Each school corporation participating in the Rural and Low Income School Program will execute a professional development plan that provides scientifically based professional development for all its instructional staff.

Exhibit Three:

    1. State Board Rule 511 IAC 6.2 requiring all schools in Indiana to have a school Improvement plan in which a plan for professional development is required.

    2. Rule for applying for state funds for professional development.

**Strategic and Continuous School Improvement and Achievement Plan
(511 IAC 6.2)**

  General Requirements

- A plan shall lay out objectives for a three (3) year period and must be annually reviewed and revised to accomplish the achievement objectives of the school.

- A plan must establish objectives for the school to achieve. These achievement objectives must be consistent with <u>academic standards</u> and include improvement in at least the following areas:

    (1) Attendance rate.

04/15/05

(2) The percentage of students meeting academic standards under the <u>Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) program.</u>

(3) For a secondary school, graduation rate.

- A plan must specify how and to what extent the school expects to make continuous improvement in all areas of the education system where results are measured by setting benchmarks for progress on an individual school basis.

- A plan must note specific areas where improvement is needed immediately.

Required Plan Components

A plan must contain the following components for the school:

(1) A list of the statutes and rules that the school wishes to have suspended from operation for the school.

(2) A description of the curriculum and information concerning the location of a copy of the curriculum that is available for inspection by members of the public.

(3) A description and name of the assessments that will be used in the school in addition to ISTEP+ assessments.

(4) A plan to be submitted to the governing body and made available to all interested members of the public in an easily understood format.

(5) A provision to maximize parental participation in the school.

(6) For a secondary school, a provision to do the following:
    (a) Offer courses that allow all students to become eligible to receive an Academic Honors Diploma.
    (b) Encourage all students to earn an Academic Honors Diploma or complete the Core 40 curriculum.

(7) A provision to maintain a safe and disciplined learning environment for students and teachers.

(8) A provision for the coordination of technology initiatives.

(9) The professional development program should include the following:
    (a) A narrative that includes:
      (i) A summary analysis of data regarding student learning.
      (ii) Strategies, programs, and services to address student learning needs.
      (iii) Activities to implement the strategies, programs and services.
      (iv) Evaluation that will be conducted of the impact of the activities.
    (b) An assurance that the program complies with the board's core principles for professional development.

(10)   The professional development program must be signed by the exclusive representatives as an indication of support only for the professional development program component of the plan.

04/15/05

OMB NO. 1810-0614

<div style="border:1px solid black; text-align:center;">

XIII. Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)

</div>

A. State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2003-2004 school year? _____**NO**_____

B. Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds

1. Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2003-2004 school year. ____**110**_____

2. In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds TO eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred TO eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	50	523,172
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	24	192,241
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	14	220,629
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	83	2,223,247
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	17	225,334

04/15/05

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds FROM eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred FROM eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	82	2,299,598
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	42	367,127
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	50	543,872
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	21	181,028

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.

04/15/05